

ZHOU et al.  
Serial No. 09/878,327  
Response to Office Action dated October 6, 2004

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to delete the second occurrence of "system" in line thereof. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 on this basis is respectfully requested.

Amendments of a formal nature have been made to claims 2 and 8. These amendments were not necessitated by any rejection nor are these amendments made for reasons relating to patentability.

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Win *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,353).

Each of the independent claims 1, 7 and 13 calls for automatically generating mirror persons from an LDAP user account entry and maintaining the mirror persons within a plurality of resources to identify the user across the resources. As described in connection with an illustrative, non-limiting example implementation in the subject patent application, multiple mirror persons may be generated, *i.e.*, one for each resource. In this way, a user may, for example, use the same username and password to identify himself/herself across multiple resources. This reduces confusion among users resulting from multiple user names/passwords. In addition, the maintenance and updating of "persons" in the resources is eased.

Win *et al.* does not disclose or suggest the concept of mirror persons as claimed. In connection with the claimed mirror persons, the office action references col. 6, lines 44-65 of Win *et al.* which describe "cookies" sent from an authentication client module to the user's browser and then from the user's browser to a protected resource. More specifically, upon verifying the correct entry of a user's name and password, an authentication client module reads the user's roles from the registry server. It then encrypts and sends this information in a cookie to the user's browser. When the user selects a resource, the browser sends an open URL request and a cookie to a protected web server. The protected web server decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is authorized to access the resource. The cookie is also used by the resource to return information that is customized based on the user's name and roles.

ZHOU et al.

Serial No. 09/878,327

Response to Office Action dated October 6, 2004

The cookies of Win *et al.* are not the claimed mirror persons. Among other things, the cookies are not maintained within a plurality of resources to identify a user (or users) across the resources as claimed. To the extent cookies are maintained, they are maintained by a user's browser, not resources such as the protected servers. *See, e.g., Win et al.*, col. 6, lines 49-50 ("Each cookie is saved by browser 100 until the cookie expires.") *See also Win et al.* col. 10, line 64 *et seq.* Win *et al.* describes the sending of the cookies to the protected servers and the using by the servers of information in the cookies in order to authorize access to the server. However, there is no disclosure maintaining the cookies in the protected servers. Because the cookies of Win *et al.* lack at least one attribute of the claimed mirror persons (*e.g.*, being maintained within a plurality of resources), the cookies cannot constitute the claimed mirror persons. For at least this reason, Win *et al.* cannot anticipate claims 1, 7 and 13 or the claims that depend therefrom. *See, e.g., Verdegaa Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.").

Claims 5, 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as allegedly being "obvious" over Win *et al.* in view of "what is well-known in the art." These claims depend respectively from claims 1, 7 and 13. While not acquiescing in the characterizations in the office action, Win *et al.* would still be deficient with respect to these dependent claims even assuming (for the sake of argument only) that the allegations in the office action with respect to the features of claims 5, 11 and 15 were proper.

New claims 16-18 have been added. The subject matter of these claims is fully supported by the original disclosure and no new matter has been added. *See, e.g.,* paragraphs [0005] and [0019]. These claims are believed to be allowable because of their dependency from claims, 7 and 13 and because of the additional patentable features contained therein.

ZHOU et al.  
Serial No. 09/878,327  
Response to Office Action dated October 6, 2004

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:



Michael J. Shea  
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100